

FROM THE DIRECTOR ACQUISITION CAREER MANAGEMENT OFFICE

I would like to introduce a new feature in *Army AL&T* magazine. "Ask The ACMO" will include responses to some of the most frequently asked questions submitted to the Acquisition Career Management Office (ACMO). As I wrote in my last letter, your goals drive what we, the ACMO, need to accomplish in terms of the "what, where, when, and how" of professional development. We welcome your questions and want to provide the answers you need.

In this issue's Ask The ACMO section, a question is raised regarding the difference between Corps Eligible status and Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) membership. Relative to AAC membership, since we opened membership to those reaching Level III certification, we have received a wonderful response, and we are processing the requests for membership as soon as possible. Letters of acceptance are being routinely signed, but the actual membership certificates will be delayed until the new Army Acquisition Executive is named and confirmed.

Now in its fourth year, the Competitive Development Group (CDG) Program continues to thrive. I am pleased to congratulate CDG year group (YG) 98 graduates and to welcome new members of the CDG Program. The YG02 CDG orientation was held Aug. 21-22, 2001, in the National Capital Region in Springfield, VA. Be sure to read the article on the YG02 CDG orientation in the January-February 2002 issue of *Army AL&T* magazine. That issue will also feature an article on the annual Army Acquisition Workshop held August 6-9, 2001, in Atlanta, GA.

I also suggest that you read the article on the AAC Training With Industry (TWI) Orientation Workshop held July 2001 in Springfield, VA, in the November-December issue of *Army AL&T* magazine.

The Army's TWI Program was initiated in response to the Army's critical need for officers with state-of-the-art skills in industrial practices and procedures, skills not readily attained through formal education programs. We are currently expanding the program to include civilians. TWI now affords both AAC officers and civilians training opportunities in an industry environment where commercial best practices are closely observed. Industry hosts can observe and interact with AAC members in a commercial environment. All program participants act as ambassadors, communicating the Army vision and values to those in the business community.

Please pay close attention to the recently published acquisition education, training and experience and Army Tuition Assistance Program training policies. We've made changes to strengthen program execution but not decrease training opportunities. Requirements continue to grow

while training dollars remain tight. Thus, we must ensure efficient administration of training opportunities.

On another note, I am pleased to announce that ACMO Deputy Director Craig Spisak is attending the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. I regret that he will be gone for the next 10 months, but the Army will gain a more valuable asset upon his return.

Finally, I would like to invite you to stop by the AAC display at the annual Association of the United States Army (AUSA) meeting, Oct. 15-17 at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, DC. You will also have an opportunity to visit our acquisition career management suite located in the Johnson Room at the hotel.

The ACMO continues to focus on providing the best support to ensure a well-trained, educated, and revitalized acquisition and technology workforce. We've got you covered!

COL Frank C. Davis III
Director
Acquisition Career
Management Office

ASK THE ACMO . . .

In an effort to better serve Army Acquisition and Technology Workforce members, *Army AL&T* magazine will periodically publish responses to your most frequently asked questions beginning with this issue of the magazine. These responses, which will be provided by the Director of the Acquisition Career Management Office (ACMO) or by a Regional Director, will appear along with your questions under the headline "Ask The ACMO" in the Career Development Update section of the magazine. Your questions must be submitted via the Army Acquisition Corps home page at <http://dacm.rdaisa.army.mil/>. Point to **Comments/Feedback** at the top right of the page and send your submission to the ACMO Director or to one of the three listed Regional Directors. Please do not send your questions to *Army AL&T* magazine.

I am currently pursuing college courses but have not yet completed my degree requirements. How do I reflect this on my Acquisition Career Record Brief (ACRB)?

To make a change to your ACRB, you must first contact your Acquisition Career Manager. Until you complete 1 year of college, your ACRB should reflect "some college (less than 1 year)" and the university designated. Upon completion of 1 year, an entry should be made to indicate "1 year of college" and the university designated.

At 2 years, if an associate's degree is achieved, this should be entered with the date of completion. If an associate's degree is not achieved, then the phrase "2 years of college" should be entered.

If you are pursuing education beyond the bachelor's degree, your ACRB entry should be displayed as Post Bachelor's with the university identified, but no graduation year. If you are pursuing education beyond the master's degree, then it should be displayed as Post Master's with the university designated, but no graduation/completion date.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

What is the difference between Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) membership and Corps Eligible (CE) status?

Primarily, there are four key differences between AAC membership and CE status:

- AAC membership requires mobility agreements, CE status does not;
- Applications for AAC membership are submitted to the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command; applications for CE status are submitted to the Acquisition Career Management Office National Capital Region;
- AAC membership is restricted to personnel GS-13 and above (or equivalent personnel demonstration broadband level); CE status is not restricted by grade; and
- AAC membership is required of critical acquisition position (CAP) incumbents; CE status is not mandatory for any Acquisition and Technology Workforce (A&TWF) position.

To fully understand the impact these differences have on the A&TWF professional, one must understand the philosophies behind the two designations and the progression from CE status to AAC member.

CE status identifies an individual as someone in an upcoming population of acquisition professionals, designates eligibility for AAC membership, provides opportunities for career enhancement in preparation for senior leadership positions, streamlines the AAC accession process, and identifies an applicant pool for specific AAC position announcements and centralized boards. Many of these opportunities are identified in the Acquisition Education, Training and Experience Catalog.

AAC membership is required of all CAP incumbents and is available to select personnel GS-13 and above (or equivalent personnel demonstration broadband level) who have obtained CE status AND who have accomplished Level III certification in an acquisition career field (ACF). Additionally, AAC members can distinguish themselves by belonging to a professional corps that recognizes their career accomplishments and potential as future acquisition leaders.

Eligibility requirements for AAC membership and CE status are identical: 4 years of acquisition experience, a baccalaureate degree, 12/24 semester credit hours in business, Level II certification, or Level II training in an ACF.

For complete guidance on AAC membership and CE status, visit our Web site at <http://dacm.rdaisa.army.mil/> and click on **Policy/Procedures**.

I have taken all required Defense Acquisition University (DAU) training. Why isn't my certification listed on my Acquisition Career Record Brief (ACRB)?

Completion of DAU training is only one aspect of obtaining certification. The Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act requires the Secretary of Defense to establish education, training, and experience requirements for all acquisition positions based on the level of complexity of a

position. Acquisition career field (ACF) position certification requirements are detailed in DoD 5000.52-M. These requirements are also specified in the DAU Catalog, which is located online at <https://dau.fedworld.gov/dau/ondes.htm>.

To attain certification, individuals must meet all education, training, and experience standards established for an ACF. Actual certification is accomplished when a certifying official confirms by signature that an individual meets the mandatory standards for an ACF and an acquisition career level.

Individuals should work with their Acquisition Career Manager (ACM) to ensure their education, training, and experience achievements are documented on their ACRBs or Officer Record Briefs (ORBs). The next step is to sign the updated ACRB or ORB, annotate Section X to indicate the ACF and level of certification requested, obtain your supervisor's initials, and provide the ACRB or ORB, along with your work experience (resume or DA Form 2302), to your ACM. ACMs may require more data to verify experience. ACMs will review and forward this data to a certifying official. Once a certifying official has approved the certification, the ACM will disseminate the certification documents and provide the requesting individual the original, signed ACRB or ORB. The ACRB or ORB signed by the individual and the certifying official is the official record of certification—not the certificate.

For detailed information on Army acquisition certification policy and procedures, go to <http://dacm.rdaisa.army.mil> (point to **Policy/Procedures**, and click on **Certification**).

29 Graduate From MAM Course

In June 2001, 29 students graduated from the Materiel Acquisition Management (MAM) Course, Class 01-003, at the Army Logistics Management College, Fort Lee, VA. The graduates included 25 Army officers, 1 Navy SEAL, 1 allied officer from Greece, and 2 Army civilians. The Distinguished Graduate Award was presented to MAJ Hely Dave Wood, an Army aviator assigned as a Functional Area 50 Manager, 2nd Infantry Division, Korea.

The 7-week MAM Course provides a broad perspective of the materiel acquisition process and includes a discussion of national policies and objectives that shape it. Areas of coverage include combat developments, research and development, test and evaluation, budgeting and cost estimating, acquisition logistics, software acquisition, production management, risk assessment, and contracting. Emphasis is on developing professionals who will manage the acquisition process.

Research and development, program management, materiel testing, contracting, requirements generation, and materiel fielding are typical acquisition work assignment areas offered to these graduates. The names of the graduates follow.

Burris, CPT Joshua R.
Carter, CPT Don C.
Conroy, CPT Michael P.
Courtney, MAJ John M.
Cummings, CPT Kenneth F.
Hackett, CPT Christine A.
Heck, CPT Joseph D.
Hinkle, Robert C. (CIV)
Hoffman, MAJ Curtis W.
Hribar, CPT Robert S.
Kimball, CPT Charles F.
Kreun, CPT David R.
Lafontaine, CPT David R.
Meehan, CPT Scott A.
Miller, MAJ Michael

Nerdig, CPT Daniel A.
Newell, MAJ Michael W.
Ogburn, CPT John D.
Paul, MAJ Gregory J.
Paulus, CPT Mark L.
Poole, MAJ Robert M.
Roane, Constance T. (CIV)
Smith, CPT Robert S.
Soule, BMCS David C.
Stawowczyk, MAJ Edward J.
Vergidis, CPT George E.
(Greece)
Welsh, MAJ Robert H.
Williams, CPT Kevin D.
Wood, MAJ Hely Dave

Memo Provides Guidance On A&TWF Assimilation

On July 11, 2001, the Deputy Director for Acquisition Career Management signed a memorandum providing guidance on the Army's implementation of the refined Packard Commission acquisition and technology workforce (A&TWF) definition. Guidance in this memorandum provides commands with a step-by-step process for identifying civilian acquisition positions and for assimilating those in newly identified civilian acquisition positions into the A&TWF. Per Office of the Secretary of Defense guidance, assimilation is defined as entry of a newly identified workforce member's acquisition data in the Defense Civilian Personnel Data System, and must be accomplished by Oct. 31, 2001.

It is important to note that command points of contact recently completed their position review process and entered the updated information on spreadsheets. The Acquisition Career Management Office (ACMO) then reviewed and sorted the information by regional Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) and submitted it to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs for dissemination to the CPOCs.

The refined Packard definition for identifying members of the DOD acquisition workforce was approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) on May 13, 1999. Subsequently, on April 6, 2001, the USD(AT&L) issued a memorandum containing instructions for assimilating newly identified personnel into the Defense Civilian Personnel Data System. The refined Packard definition will now be used in conjunction with the DoD 5000.52-M position category descriptions to identify and categorize new A&TWF personnel and to assimilate incumbents of "key" positions defined by the Packard definition into the workforce. These do not include clerical and administrative support personnel.

The refined Packard definition uses three categories of occupations and two groupings of organizations to identify the workforce. Category I includes occupations counted throughout all DOD organizations. These are occupations such as contracting or program management. Category II is

composed of specific occupational series in specific organizations and is divided into two subcategories. Category IIA consists of acquisition-related organizations such as the Army Materiel Command and the Army Acquisition Executive Support Agency. Category IIB includes science and technology occupations in organizations such as the Army Research Laboratory. Category III is used to add any key acquisition and technology positions not listed above or to delete any Category II positions that are not applicable.

Under implementation guidance, commands can eliminate individual noncritical positions that are not associated with one of the existing category descriptions or positions that require less than 50 percent acquisition duties; however, only the Director for Acquisition Career Management may eliminate a critical acquisition position that is identified under the refined Packard definition. The Army will closely monitor additions that fall outside the definition and may disapprove those that are not considered to be key acquisition positions. It should be noted that there are also acquisition positions that exist outside the definition that may be included. For example, there are a number of previously identified Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act positions not included in the Packard definition.

Under the new implementation guidance, all acquisition positions will be coded on the Table of Distribution and Allowances, thus allowing the ACMO to identify both "spaces" and "faces" in the workforce. While both military and civilian acquisition positions will be coded, the assimilation guidance applies only to civilians. There is currently no impact on the policy for identifying military acquisition positions and accessing military personnel into the A&TWF.

When fully implemented, the refined Packard definition will provide an effective, independently verifiable, uniform system for identifying acquisition positions. The definition will also assist in managing and training the key A&TWF and ensure that all professional development programs are available to each member of the workforce.

Webster University Names Top Graduate School Student

On May 31, 2001, MAJ Charles Wells, an Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) officer participating in the Acquisition Graduate Degree Program (AGDP) as a student in the resident U.S. Army Command and General Staff Officer Course (CGSOC), received the Webster University Outstanding Graduate School Student Award for academic year 2000-2001. Webster University is the AGDP provider at Fort Leavenworth, KS. Wells was nominated and selected by Webster University faculty from more than 170 students participating in its graduate programs at its Fort Leavenworth campus.

The award ceremony was held in conjunction with the AGDP commencement at Fort Leavenworth, where Wells and 17 other AAC officers received acquisition-related M.A. degrees from Webster University. Officers who received M.A. degrees in procurement and acquisition management were MAJ Wayne Epps, MAJ Jeffrey Hager, MAJ Tonie Jackson,

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

MAJ Lewis Johnson, MAJ John Jones, MAJ Yewston Myers, MAJ John O'Regan, MAJ Matthew Schnaidt, MAJ Kevin Stoddard, MAJ Edward Swanson, and MAJ Reginald Terry. In addition, Wells and the following officers received M.A. degrees in computer resources and information management: MAJ Albert Grubbs, MAJ Ruthann Haider, MAJ Kevin Hillman, MAJ Walter Jones, MAJ James Mitchell, and MAJ Duane Riddle. Randy Wright, Webster University Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Director of Military Programs, gave the commencement address.

The AGDP is a fully funded program that permits selected Acquisition Corps members to complete an acquisition-related advanced degree concurrently with their attendance in the resident CGSOC. Acquisition Corps officers selected for the resident CGSOC who are interested in

the AGDP should contact the Chief of the Acquisition Education and Training Program, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth at (913) 684-5330/5329 or DSN 552-5330/5329.

PERSCOM Notes . . .

FY02 LTC/GS-14 PM/AC Slate

The U.S. Total Army Personnel Command recently released the FY02 lieutenant colonel (LTC)/GS-14 product manager (PM)/acquisition command (AC) slate. The following slate consists of 41 officers (all lieutenant colonels) and 6 civilians.

NAME	SLATE	COMMAND
Bezwada, Haribabu (CIV)	INFO TECH SERVICES	AMC
Bither, David E.	TAC OPS CTR C2 (C3S)	AAESA
Blyth, Jeffrey B.	COMM MGT SYS (C3S)	AAESA
Borgardts, Allen L.	GND CBT TACT TRAINING	AMC
Carpenter, Robert C.	SMALL ARMS	AMC
Crabb, Jeffrey A.	SCOUT/ATTACK HELICOPTER	AMC
Dukes, Beatrice S.	DCMC ST LOUIS	DCMA
Earl, Arthur J.	DEF SAT COMM SYS INSTAL	AMC
Edwards, Keith R.	DCMC BOEING MESA, AZ	DCMA
Ellis, Carl M.	DCMC INDIANAPOLIS	DCMA
Ellis, William (CIV)	RADIO FREQ CM (AVN)	AAESA
Fletcher, James P.	NON-STOCK CHEM DISP (CHEM D)	AAESA
Giunta, Joseph A. Jr.	AIR & COMMAND TACT TRAINING	AMC
Green, William L. III	18TH ABN CONTRACTING CMD	FORSCOM
Greene, Bradley D.	TACT APPLICATIONS	BMDO
Healy, Edward A. Jr.	TECH APPLICATIONS	SOCOM
Hines, Claude Jr. (MSC)	MED C4 (STAMIS)	AAESA
Ikirt, Steven C.	DCMC GENERAL DYN LIMA, OH	DCMA
Jenkins, Kennedy E.	DCMC KUWAIT	DCMA
Jennings, Kevin N.	PALADIN/FA AMMO SPT VEH	AMC
Kihara, Steven W.	AV TECH TEST CENTER	ATEC
Klumpp, Joseph J.	ARMY HUMAN RES SYS (STAMIS)	AAESA
Lamb, William L.	NMD IFICS/COMMO (NMD)	AAESA
Lepine, Paul R.	TENCAP-DEVELOPMENT	SMDC
Madden, Michael (CIV)	TESAR (IEWS)	AAESA
Malatesta, Mark L.	BIO PT DETECTION SYS (BIO D)	AAESA
Manning, Barry G.	PAC III MSL (AMD)	AAESA
McVeigh, Bryan J.	IAV CBT SUPPORT (GCSS)	AAESA
Moore, David M.	MANEUVER CONTROL SYS (C3S)	AAESA
Nicolella, Anthony J.	NTC ACQ CENTER	FORSCOM
Oday, Sean P.	DCMC READING PA	DCMA
Oelberg, Gregory P.	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	AMC
Oxford, John R. Jr.	MLRS PGM (TAC MSL)	AAESA
Pietruszka, Raymond (CIV)	INFRARED CM (AVN)	AAESA
Rice, David J.	TMAS (GCSS)	AAESA
Robinson, Keith W.	UH-60M	AMC

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

NAME	SLATE	COMMAND
Roitz, Frederick P.	TRADOC ACQ CENTER	TRADOC
Shalosky, Christopher	FUTURE CBT SYS (DARPA)	AAESA
Shifrin, Scott E.	STINGER BLK I (MSL PLTF)	AMC
Stockel, Eugene F.	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIP	AMC
Tubell, Wallace J. Jr.	TO BE DETERMINED	
Vanrassen, Michael J.	AMDCCS (C3S)	AAESA
Verville, Michael (CIV)	SARSS (ALIS) (STAMIS)	AAESA
Vollmecke, Kirk F.	DCMC BOEING PHILADELPHIA	DCMA
Walsh, Damon T.	PFLA-MD	DCMA
White, William (CIV)	HERCULES	AMC
Winters, Brian C.	WATERCRAFT	AMC

FY02 COL/GS-15 PM/AC Board Results

The U.S. Total Army Personnel Command's Acquisition Management Branch recently completed an analysis of the FY02 Colonel (COL)/GS-15 Project Manager (PM) and Acquisition Command (AC) Board results for Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) officers and civilians. The following paragraphs summarize the results and indicate possible trends.

Overall Results

Board members reviewed the files of 61 AAC members (37 Active duty officers and 24 civilians). From this population, the board selected 32 principals for PM and AC assignments. The selectees included 29 officers and 3 civilians. Results by year group (YG) for Army officers are as follows:

	YG77	YG78	YG79	YG80	YG81
Competed	2	6	27	1	1
Principals	0	5	22	1	1
Alternates	2	1	5	0	0

Who Was Selected?

Twenty-four of the 29 officers (83 percent) selected as principals were selected on their first time considered. Two of the three AAC civilians (67 percent) selected as principals were selected the first time considered. Twenty-six (90 percent) of the Army officers selected are Senior Service College (SSC) graduates, and two (67 percent) of the civilian selectees are also SSC graduates. Twenty-seven (93 percent) of the officers selected have served as lieutenant colonel (LTC) PMs or in AC assignments. One of the

civilian selectees previously served as both a GS-14 and GS-15 PM. The other two civilians had experience as deputy PMs at the GS-15 level.

General Observations

Officers are selected for COL PM/AC the first or second time considered after completion of SSC and successful LTC PM/AC assignments. With few exceptions, a successful command was one where at least 50 percent of an officer's command Officer Evaluation Reports were rated above center of mass (ACOM). Previous program office experience at the critical acquisition position level continues to be the most important combination for civilians to be competitive for PM/AC. However, there is no evidence that consecutive or repetitive program office tours better qualify an individual for PM selection. On the contrary, a very successful product management tour, coupled with successful performance in a major headquarters staff position, is a common formula for PM selection. Contracting officers require extensive contracting training and experience combined with a very successful contracting command assignment. Again, success in a major headquarters staff position enhances overall file strength toward selection.

Summary

Because of the competitiveness for command, AAC members must pay close attention to the components of their board file to ensure accurate information is provided to board members so they can make an informed decision. The trend continues for command boards to select acquisition professionals with a diverse acquisition background coupled with a successful LTC/GS-14 PM/AC assignment.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

FY02 COL/GS-15 PM/AC Selectees

All selectees are LTC(P) unless otherwise indicated.

Bianca, Damian P.	Johnson, Michael E. (COL)
Bianco, Stephen G.	Kallam, Charles T.
Bowman, Michael	Martin, Edwin H.
Buck, Stephen D.	Maxwell, Jody A. (COL)
Burke, John D.	McCoy, Curtis L.
Crosby, William T.	Mills, Ainsworth B.
Defatta, Richard P.	Nenninger, Gary S. (CIV)
Dietrick, Kevin M.	Noonan, Kevin S.
Ernst, Adolph H. III	Pallotta, Ralph G.
Fox, Steven G.	Pecoraro, Joseph E.
Gavora, William M.	Price, Nancy L.
Grotke, Mark L.	Rasmussen, Valerie A.
Heine, Kurt M.	Schmidt, Rodney H.
Hodge, Yolanda (CIV)	Sledge, Nathaniel H. Jr.
Hrdy, Russell J.	Smith, Michael
Janker, Peter S.	Sutton, James C. (CIV)

FY01 LTC Promotion Board Results

The FY01 Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) Promotion Board results were released in June 2001. The selection rate for Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) officers in the primary zone was 74.4 percent, while the selection rate for the Army competitive category was 75.7 percent.

Although the primary zone selection percentage was lower than the Army average, this year's primary zone selection rate of 74.4 percent compares very favorably with last year's rate of 64.1 percent.

Overall AAC Results

The FY01 LTC Promotion Board reviewed the files of 133 AAC officers in the primary zone. The selection board was required to select a minimum of 88 fully qualified AAC officers for promotion. However, the overall file quality of AAC officers resulted in the board selecting 99 officers. Ten AAC officers (6.6 percent) were selected from above the zone, and five officers (4.6 percent) were selected from below the zone.

Promotion Trends

A review of the files of those officers selected for promotion by the board revealed several trends leading to successful promotion. An outline of these trends follows.

Command And Staff College (CSC)

Sixty-three of 99 (63.6 percent) AAC officers selected in the primary zone attended the resident CSC. Thirty-six of 99

(36.4 percent) AAC officers selected in the primary zone completed CSC through nonresident studies. Ten officers (9.9 percent) in the primary zone did not complete CSC (either resident or nonresident), and none of these officers were selected for promotion.

Command

Company command evaluation reports appeared to be extremely important to the board. The majority of AAC officers selected for promotion received at least one above-center-of-mass (ACOM) Officer Evaluation Report (OER) as company commanders. These reports generally had either clear ACOM senior rater profiles and/or strong, exclusive senior rater comments on potential. In general, AAC officers with more than one COM command OER were not favorably considered.

Consistent COM(+) Performance/Job Progression

The last two important trends are consistent COM(+) performance throughout an officer's career and job progression. AAC officers selected for promotion generally had consistent COM(+)/ACOM OERs and demonstrated increased responsibility from one assignment to the next. OERs on selected officers generally showed increasing levels of responsibility from one assignment to the next, as well as acquisition diversity in assignments.

The New OER (DA Form 67-9)

Analysis clearly showed that the board placed significant emphasis on the new OER. Every officer considered in the primary zone had at least one new OER. Nineteen selectees had four or more DA Form 67-9 reports. Seventy-three percent of those officers selected had at least one COM DA Form 67-9 report. This reinforces the belief that a COM report is not a "career ender." However, there is a difference between a single COM report and a COM file. Those officers considered for promotion who had only COM DA Form 67-9 reports were not selected.

The DA Form 67-9 is still relatively new—not yet 5 years old. As such, it is still too early to establish long-term trends that are applicable to all future promotion boards.

Bottom Line

The board based its decision on the "whole-person" concept that includes performance, qualifications (positions held, schools attended, etc.), and Army needs (functional area requirements). Further, the board demonstrated confidence in the new OER by carefully considering both the block-check and senior rater comments.

A list of 112 AAC officers selected for promotion to LTC is shown below. An asterisk indicates below-the-zone selections. The names of two officers were not available at the time this magazine went to press. Congratulations to those selected!

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Akins, Elton D.	Grebe, Joseph A.	Ostrowski, Paul A.
Anderson, Zelma A.	Guerra, Nicholas C.	Packard, Charles J.
Aragon, Arthur J.	Haider, Michael K.	Patten, Jeffery C.
Arn, Mark R.	Hall, Randy R.	Pelczynski, Anthony S.
Bailey, Calvin D.	Hamilton, Regina J.	Peterson, Kevin B.
Benda, Gregory S.	Harris, Bobby	Poe, Matthew D.
Berlin, Jacob L.	Harvey, Christopher J.	*Potts, Anthony W.
Blackwell, Bobby F.	Herbert, Linda R.	Ramsay, Thomas A.
Bonk, Steven S.	Hinds, Russell A.	*Rand, Jaimy S.
Boyd, Cris J.	Horrocks, Brent J.	Rhodes, William B.
Butler, Matthew C.	Holzman, Simon L.	Robinson, Larnce L.
Campbell, Robert K.	Jacobsen, Scott A.	Robinson, Willard L.
Campbell, Scott A.	Jacoby, Grant A.	Rombough, Douglas H.
Carson, Craig H.	Justis, Daniel N.	Rosso, Daniel C.
Castrinos, Nicholas L.	Kirkpatrick, Robert E.	Ruiz, Gabriel
Cavalier, Michael P.	Kopra, Timothy L.	Samek, Rocky G.
Chandler, Michael R.	Lee, Stephen H.	Schumitz, Robert W.
Chapman, James J.	Lindsay, Michael A.	Silas, Lawrence S.
Childress, James S.	Long, John E.	Simpson, James E.
Clarke, Matthew T.	Lotwin, Andrew M.	Smith, Christopher F.
Clemons, Daniel C.	Lunn, Robert H.	Steves, Michael R.
*Colvin, Darryl J.	Mabry, Mark J.	Surdu, John R.
Conklin, Daryl L.	Mansir, Martin J.	Tamilio, Douglas A.
Contreras, Andres	McKsymick, Eric M.	Tarcza, Kenneth R.
Cross, Maureen W.	Meister, David P.	*Thurgood, Leon N.
Darrow, Keith R.	Merritt, Layne B.	Tomlin, Karen D.
Daugherty, Anne R.	Mockensturm, Jeffrey J.	Torrent, Fernando L.
David, Jackie W.	Morton, Dwayne A.	Wagner, Eric C.
Davis, Dawne M.	Mullis, William S.	Wason, John D.
Decato, Steven W.	Munoz, Daniel M.	Watts, Charles D.
Dedecker, Craig A.	Myers, James M.	Wendel, John M.
Dietrich, Shane	Nieto, Anthony J.	Wical, Steven C.
Drake, Steven G.	Noble, Earl D.	Wickham, Tracy L.
Ellis, John A.	Norris, James W.	Wills, Michael D.
Fields, Gregory M.	O'Donell, Warren N.	Wood, Bradley J.
Flynn, Karl S.	Oliver, Christopher M.	Yurkanin, Kathryn M.
*Gabbert, Jeffrey A.	Olson, Thomas M.	
Gilmartin, Robert F.	Openshaw, Shane T.	

U.S. Army Experimental Test Pilot Selection Board

One of the responsibilities of the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command's (PERSCOM's) Acquisition Management Branch (AMB) is to manage the Army Aviation Experimental Test Pilot Training Program. Under this program, Active duty Army aviators attend the U.S. Naval Test Pilot School (USNTPS).

The FY01 U.S. Army Aviation Experimental Test Pilot Training Program Selection Board was held May 7-8, 2001. Congratulations to the following "best-qualified" commissioned and warrant officers who were selected to attend the USNTPS.

MAJ Paul D. Howard
CPT George D. Bailey Jr.
CPT Evan J. Brown
CPT James W. Frazier
CPT Michael G. Olmstead

CPT Robert A. Willis
CW4 John K. Heinecke
CW3 Scott E. Hutchesson
CW2 James L. Stidfole

Commissioned officers selected for the program are automatically awarded Functional Area 51 (Research, Development and Acquisition) and accessed into the Army Acquisition Corps. PERSCOM's Warrant Officer Division will continue to manage warrant officers selected for the program. Selected candidates will attend the 11-month test pilot program at the USNTPS at Patuxent River Naval Air Station, MD. Two classes are held every year; one begins in July and the other the following January. These officers may also be required to spend 12-18 months at a civilian educational institution pursuing an aeronautical engineering degree program prior to entering USNTPS.

After successfully completing the USNTPS program, graduates are assigned to a tour as experimental test pilots at the U.S. Army Aviation Technical Test Center, Fort Rucker, AL. Subsequent assignments are consistent with the officer's

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

designated functional area specialty and the needs of the Army. Officers in research, development and acquisition positions may serve either as experimental test pilots or in positions affecting the type, design, and configuration of Army aircraft.

This year's board was highly competitive. Those interested in applying for next year's selection board should review the information in the following paragraphs. Board members will thoroughly review all aspects of an application packet.

Academic Background

The academic program at USNTPS is extremely rigorous and challenging because it involves the simultaneous demands of academics as well as a flight syllabus and report writing. Accordingly, applicants should have a strong background in mathematics, engineering, and other related courses, with above-average grades. Applicants should ensure that these courses are annotated on official transcripts from the academic institution. If a course that may qualify for equivalency was taken, supporting documentation should be included in the packet.

At a minimum, warrant officers are required to have completed college algebra, calculus, differential equations, and physics (or mechanics). Commissioned officers are required to have a formal degree in engineering or the hard sciences. Highly desired courses include mechanics (structures, solids, statics, and dynamics), thermo and fluid dynamics, aerodynamics, stability and control theory, and advanced mathematics.

Overall, the academic performance in all areas as well as cumulative grade point average is considered when assessing an applicant's ability to complete the stringent academic requirements of the USNTPS program. For this year's board, many warrant officer applicants were missing one or more of the required courses.

Flight Hours

The minimum flight requirements are 700 hours for commissioned officers and 1,000 hours for warrant officers. DA Form 759, *Individual Flight Record and Flight Certificate-Army*, will be reviewed in detail to determine the scope of the applicant's flight experience. Emphasis is placed on operational flight hours versus time accrued in a simulator. For this year's board, most selected candidates surpassed the minimum hour requirement by approximately 33 percent. Pilot-in-command time is weighed heavily as an indicator of aviation experience and maturity. Ratings as an instructor pilot, instrument flight examiner, and maintenance test pilot are also viewed favorably. Civilian fixed-wing ratings and training are viewed favorably as well and should be documented appropriately. However, civilian hours do not count toward the minimum flight-hour requirement.

Endorsements

Letters of recommendation from an instructor pilot/standardization instructor pilot (IP/SIP) pertaining to an applicant's flying abilities and potential should be included. Applicants should ensure that IP/SIP endorsements are current. Other endorsements may be included within the packet and will be given due consideration.

Chain Of Command

Application packets require endorsement by the officer's chain of command through the O-6 level. Officers in advanced civil schooling should also use their current chain of command through the O-6 level. The endorsement can be routed through the chain of command on the application memorandum or be included under separate cover.

Time On Station

This year's selection board chose officers to attend either USNTPS Class 123 (July 2, 2001-June 3, 2002) or Class 124 (Jan. 3, 2002-Dec. 3, 2002). Officers are required to have at least 1 year time on station per the board message. This allows the officer to attend the USNTPS in one of the above classes while fulfilling a minimum of 2 years time on station within their current assignment. For next year's board, applicants must have at least 12 months time on station by April 2002. Students in advanced civil schooling are the only exception.

The next USNTPS board session is tentatively scheduled for April 2002. Interested applicants should review the MILPER message announcing the FY02 USNTPS board session (to be released around October 2001) to verify that they meet the minimum requirements. Commissioned officers interested in applying for the test pilot program should contact MAJ Jeff Bochonok at (703) 325-2800/DSN 221-2800, or e-mail Jeffrey.Bochonok@hoffman.army.mil. Warrant officers should contact CW3 Kim Young at (703) 325-5251/DSN 221-5251, or e-mail kim.young@hoffman.army.mil.

Student Writing Award Winners

The Commandant of the U.S. Army War College (AWC) recently announced the names of recipients of student writing awards for academic year 2001. Listed below are Army Acquisition Corps members who won awards, the name of the award they received, and the titles of their papers.

LTC Nathaniel H. Sledge won the third place award in the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Strategy Essay Contest for his paper *Broken Promises: The United States, China, and Nuclear Non-Proliferation*.

LTC Kevin M. Dietrick received the AWC Foundation Award For Outstanding Strategy Research Paper for his work *Whence The Army's Role in Space*.

LTC Michael Bowman won the COL Don and Mrs. Anne Bussey Military Intelligence Writing Award for his work *Center of Gravity Analysis: Preparing for Intelligent Agents*.